

Appl. No.: 10/519,270  
Reply to Office Action of: 09/21/2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Benzoni et al. (US 5,337,398). Claims 7, 13 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Benzoni et al. (US 5,337,398). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended above to clarify applicants' claimed invention. Claim 1 claims that a center axis of the optic fibre hole is aligned generally perpendicular to the support structure. In Benzoni et al. the center axis of the bore 54 is parallel to the support structure 50, 52. Claim 1 also claims arranging at least three stud bumps on the surface of the component. In Benzoni et al. there is no disclosure or suggestion of arranging at least three stud bumps on the surface of the component 26 or 28. Claim 1 also claims arranging the stud bumps at least partially in the optic fibre hole along the periphery of the hole for alignment of the component to the hole. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Benzoni et al. of arranging the stud bumps at least partially in the optic fibre hole (54) along the periphery of the hole (54) for alignment of the component (26 or 28) to the hole (54). The features of claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 2-9 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 1. However, to

Appl. No.: 10/519,270  
Reply to Office Action of: 09/21/2006

expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claim 10 has been amended above to clarify applicants' claimed invention. Claim 10 claims that a center axis of the optic fibre hole is aligned generally perpendicular to the support structure. In Benzoni et al. the center axis of the bore 54 is parallel to the support structure 50, 52; not perpendicular. Claim 10 also claims at least three stud bumps arranged on the surface of the component located at least partially in the optic fibre hole along a periphery of the hole, for aligning the component centered to the hole. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Benzoni et al. of at least three stud bumps arranged on the surface of the component (26, or 28) located at least partially in the optic fibre hole (54) along a periphery of the hole (54), for aligning the component (26 or 28) centered to the hole (54). The features of claim 10 are not disclosed or suggested in the art of record. Therefore, claim 10 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 11-16 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 10. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claim 17 has been amended above to clarify applicants' claimed invention. Claim 17 claims that a center axis of the optic fibre hole is aligned generally perpendicular to the support structure. In Benzoni et al. the center axis of the bore 54 is parallel to the support structure 50, 52; not

Appl. No.: 10/519,270  
Reply to Office Action of: 09/21/2006

perpendicular. Claim 17 also claims that the stud bumps are located, at least partially, in the hole and contact walls of the hole to align the component relative to the hole. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Benzoni et al. of the stud bumps being located, at least partially, in the hole (54) and contact walls of the hole (54) to align the component (26 or 28) relative to the hole (54). The features of claim 17 are not disclosed or suggested in the art of record. Therefore, claim 17 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 18-20 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 17. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

DEC. 20. 2006 1:37PM

HARRINGTON & SMITH

NO. 681 P. 10

Appl. No.: 10/519,270  
Reply to Office Action of: 09/21/2006

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington

Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686)

12/20/06

Date

Customer No.: 29683  
Harrington & Smith, LLP  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212  
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

12/20/2006  
Date

Clair F. Main  
Name of Person Making Deposit